

Date: Tue, 22 Jun 93 04:30:21 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #202
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 22 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 202

Today's Topics:

ARRL EMI/RFI help (was Re: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action)
 Blind VEs
 jammers and fcc
NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 21 Jun 93 09:56:48 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL EMI/RFI help (was Re: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <1993Jun16.191120.29322@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>>Well as one embroilled in such a fight, I can tell you that technology has
>>little to do with it. In my situation the biggest concerns are EMI and
>>aesthetics.

>

>Yes, but visibility has *everything* to do with it. Aside from the
>aesthetics, a tower unfortunately means "scapegoat" for any RFI complaints
>in the neighborhood. Not to mention the Broderites ("you're irradiating
>my children!").

I have half-jokingly suggested to hams that if they install a new tower or antenna that they should NOT hook up the transmitter to the antenna until they take care of all of the EMI complaints first! :-).

Actually, most EMI problems can be solved. The ARRL has put together quite an arsenal of tools that hams can use to solve their EMI or bioeffects problems:

The ARRL EMI/RFI Package: Contains a reprint of the February and March 1992 QST "Lab Notes" columns on EMI. The reprint discusses the personal and technical issues associated with any EMI problem. It also includes a list of places to buy filters, EMI-resistant telephones, etc. In addition, it also contains two copies of our EMI/RFI Consumer Pamphlet. (See description that follows.) If you request any of the other packages, please also request this one -- the others are all supplemental to the EMI/RFI Package.

EMI/RFI Consumer Pamphlet: This pamphlet discusses the personal and technical aspects of EMI problems from your neighbor's point of view. We include two in each EMI/RFI Package (one for you and one for your neighbor). If you have several neighbors with problems, ask for as many as you need. (If anyone would like a quantity for their local club meeting, contact me here at ARRL HQ - Ed Hare - KA1CV ehare@arrl.org).

EMI/RFI - Telephone Package: Contains a reprint of the QST "Lab Notes" column on telephone RFI. (See also the EMI/RFI Package.)

EMI/RFI - Audio: Contains a reprint of the QST "Lab Notes" column on audio EMI. (See also the EMI/RFI Package.)

EMI/RFI - Automotive: Contains reprints of GM installation guidelines, Champion EMI tips plus contact information for most automobile manufacturers.

EMI/RFI - Electrical: Contains a reprint of a 1966 QST article on electrical interference. Old, but timeless!

EMI/RFI - Touchlamp: Contains reprints of several QST "Hints and Kinks" articles on interference to and from touch-to-switch lamps. (See also EMI/RFI Package.)

EMI/RFI - Intercom: Contains a reprint of the Nutone service bulletins on interference to Nutone intercoms.

Bioeffects: Contains reprints of QST and ARRL Handbook articles on the bioeffects of electromagnetic fields.

These packages have been prepared as a membership service by the

ARRL Technical Information Service. They are available for a 9"x12" SASE for each package (three units of postage are appreciated) from: (make sure you tell our secretary which package you want!)

ARRL Technical Department Secretary
225 Main St
Newington CT 06111

The ARRL sells two books about EMI/RFI:

Radio Frequency Interference -- How to Find It and Fix It. Has information about nearly any type of interference problem.

Interference Handbook. THE book for interference from power lines!

Abbreviated versions of many of our packages are available from the ARRL Automated Mail Server (info@arrl.org). Send the following commands in the text of a message to info@arrl.org:

HELP
INDEX
send FCC-ADDRESSES
send FCC-CONTACTING
send PRB-1-FL
send REG-INFO-BRANCH
send AUTO-LIST
send BIOEFFECTS
send EMI-GEN
send EMI-AUDIO
send EMI-CATVI
send EMI-RF-LAMPS
send EMI-SOURCE
send EMI-TELEPHONE
quit

If anyone would like help with an EMI/RFI problem, first obtain the appropriate packages and books. If, after you have read the information, you would like some advice, contact me here at ARRL HQ by email, telephone or letter. I will see how I can help.

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed -- KA1CV

Ed Hare, KA1CV
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111

ehare@arrl.org

"The goal of every engineer is to

(203) 666-1541 - voice retire without getting blamed for a
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor major catastrophe." -- Scott Adams
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing and Dilbert

Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1993 18:29:23 GMT
From: netnews.nwnet.net!clark!pacifier!mikef@beaver.cs.washington.edu
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2009d0\$oo@chnews.intel.com> jlbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

>

>I previously post about FCC acceptance of blind VE's:

>

>>>The problem will ultimately have to be worked. The amateur community
>>>will have to prove to the FCC that alternative exam-giving means used
>>>by whatever-impaired VE's do not degrade the integrity of the process.

>

>In article <C8tvGD.Fzo@pacifier.rain.com>

> mikef@pacifier.rain.com (Mike Freeman) replies:

>

>>Wrong. As I've said before, it's up to the FCC to prove that
>>blind VEs *impair* the process -- any other action bases decisions
>>upon assumptions, not fact.

>

>Me again, in real time:

>

>I think we are forgetting who are the regulated (us) and who is the
>regulator (the FCC). If this had come up as an FCC citation given to
>a VEC, then, possibly, the FCC would have had to make a case (in front
>of itself - love these quasi-judicial whatchamacallits) and prove
>blind VE's incapable of giving an exam. However, what really happened
>is that we went out and screwed the pooch by asking them for a ruling.

>

Agreed. IMHO it was unfortunate that the situation developed as it did;
as I've said before, there were other avenues of approaching
this problem -- including quiet Congressional inquiry/pressure --
that IMHO would have solved the problem without the danger -- now
the reality -- of an adverse ruling. But Mr. Moten (WD8POF) did
not consult me or the National Federation of the Blind.

>

>Once that was done, whatever they said became law. No proof required.
>And the only legal recourse is an appeal to the federal courts. Which
>is a much bigger and far more expensive pooch-screwing exercise.

>

I disagree that no proof is required. However, as you say, it *may* have to go to the courts -- an outcome it is devoutly to be hoped that can be avoided for courts can just as easily make adverse precedents more entrenched as reverse them.

>

>The only alternative to this would be to work the problem through the
>back channels of the FCC and ask them to issue a "clarification" on
>their ruling. But that requires convincing quite a few people that
>they made a mistake. And one of the things that would make that
>argument compelling would be a "proof" that the integrity of the
>exam-giving process would not be compromised.

>

The problem with this is that it would be an open-ended proof. By asking someone to prove that something will NOT happen, you are, in effect, asking him/her to be omniscient. Only God, if he/she/it exists, is omniscient. IMHO it is unfair to expect of humanity that which only God can fulfill.

Besides, there are other ways to prove the FCC's fears to be groundless. FCC could take account of the experiences of the blind over the past half-century which have shown that the blind can successfully function as teachers (including proctoring of exams) and have served well in numerous situations which required detection of fraud.

>

>Mike Freeman again:

>

>>... But (and I know many do not wish to read this in this
>>forum) the stakes for the blind are far higher than just whether
>>blind VEs will be allowed to do their stuff. There are blind
>>education majors right now who are having teachers' certificates
>>denied them because they cannot, in the opinion of those to whom
>>they must apply, they cannot "observe" the classroom. There
>>have been several court cases on this subject -- we, the blind, have,
>>in the end, won them all. If we let this precedent stand,
>>it could jeopardize the gains made by blind teachers during the
>>past few years. By the same token, FCC should take account of
>>these court cases and their implications.

>

>Me:

>

>If you place it in that context, it does become a much bigger issue.
>I agree it is a very bad precedent and should not be allowed to stand.
>And, quite frankly, I was surprised that the FCC ruled this way, given
>the ongoing movement to make government activities accessible to
>people with physical impairments.

>

I was not. Once FCC began to apply (even if only in a few cases)

different standards to the disabled than are applied to the able-bodied (via PR90-356 -- the QRQ code test waiver), it was inevitable that FCC would begin to consider the disabled less than capable of performing to the same standards as others. There ain't no such thing as a free lunch!

>

>Mike:

>

>>... But we must work together as equal partners -- the blind must >>not be required to prove *anything*...

>

>Me:

>

>I see it as amateur radio operators having to, once again, prove >something to *government*. And, unfortunately, as in the past, it >will be the operators most affected by this who will carry most of the >weight.

>

Perhaps. But if we start down that road, the proof will be never-ending.

73!

--

Mike Freeman		Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA		GEnie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221		Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1993 22:51:46 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!udel!news.intercon.com!psinnntp!iat.holonet.net!
knbing@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: jammers and fcc
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

in new york city we have a severe jammer problem, and what i wanna know what exactly the OO (official observers) do and how they do it,(and why) for the city and the fcc. it seems the the fcc dosent give a squat about jammers

(jammers with call signs that is)

i would like to know who can actually do something about the menacing of the public airways that happens

Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1993 17:22:36 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!ncar!elmore@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: NQOI Case : HF Vertical Antennas
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun20.230931.20746@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>Strawman #4: Those lossy 1/4 wave verticals. Use sleeve dipoles, which get
>you above most obstructions, are unbalanced, don't require a ground radial
>system, and if you really want low loss, silver plate them to skin depth.
>Incidentally, I'll bet the sleeve dipoles will survive winds far in
>excess of that which will fold the tower - yagi combination.

Uh-oh... Height limits strike! Unless we want to inductively (or capacitively, take your pick) load these verticals, we find ourselves quite limited by what some believe to be quite reasonable, perfectly adequate height limits of 35'. Consider a 40 m set of verticals, assuming one had the room for them. Remember that in the People's Republic of Boulder, lot size doesn't matter unless it's truly impressive, like 40 acres or better.

Full-sized 40 m vertical dipoles are 66' tall, give or take a bit. Tain't no way Boulder will see fit to allow *one* of them, much less four.

Now what??

Kim Elmore, [N50P, PP ASEL/Glider 2232456]

```
* ..... *  
* Said by NQOI while working on his shack: ** "All these *wires*! Why do they call it `wireless'!?" ** ..... *
```

Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1993 15:36:57 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun17.200211.5617@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Jun18.135615.9568@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993Jun21.052335.10425@ennews.eas.asu.edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: N00I Case: A Proposal for Action

In article <1993Jun21.052335.10425@ennews.eas.asu.edu> shandrow@enuxva.eas.asu.edu (Darrell B Shandrow) writes:

>How about forming a coalition between the land mobile and amateur services
>to solve the 440/1 ghz problems then? That would seem to be more effective

>than fighting separate battles.

Unfortunately, land mobile wants our frequencies too. They might cooperate on tower restrictions, since that impacts them in a similar fashion. But we really don't want to get in bed with them about spectrum. We might get what you usually get when you get in bed with someone out for your goodies. :-)

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1993 15:09:16 GMT

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!
uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewsk!n8afd@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun16.110316.27557@ke4zv.uucp>,

<1993Jun16.162531.23480@en.ecn.purdue.edu>, <randall.740451861@moose>

Subject : Re: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:

Its a shame in my opinion that everyone has to worry about what his neighbor thinks, I thought thats what our country was founded on, individual freedom.

I submit that all CCRs with respect to amateurs is a violation of the first amendment, freedom of speech. After all aren't CCRs resticting you 1st amendment right, even if your not an amateur. You aren't free to install the means of how you want to use your freedom of expression. I'm sure you couldn't get a CCR through that did not permit telephone lines. With respect to NQ0I, if there are commercial TV and radio installations then hasn't his equal protection rights been violated?

73, N8AFD

Date: Mon, 21 Jun 93 18:28:44 GMT

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!
paulf@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <25599@drutx.ATT.COM>, <1993Jun20.230931.20746@leland.Stanford.EDU>,

<1993Jun21.172236.28357@ncar.ucar.edu>all.S
Subject : Re: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas

In article <1993Jun21.172236.28357@ncar.ucar.edu> elmore@rap.ucar.edu (Kim Elmore) writes:

> Full-sized 40 m vertical dipoles are 66' tall, give or take a
>bit. Tain't no way Boulder will see fit to allow *one* of them, much
>less four.

Fortunately, however, optimal TOA increases with increasing wavelength, so things are far less critical than at 20m. So, go ahead and center inductive load the dipoles for the low bands. Incidentally, most of the commercial 4 el 40m beams *are* loaded designs...

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: 21 Jun 1993 17:56:24 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!
news.ecn.bgu.edu!anaxagoras.ils.nwu.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu!
rdewan@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun16.162531.23480@en.ecn.purdue.edu>, <randall.740451861@moose>,
<C8z8rp.3AJ@cbnewsk.cb.att.com>wu.edu
Subject : First Amendment and NQ0I was Re: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:

In article <C8z8rp.3AJ@cbnewsk.cb.att.com> n8afd@cbnewsk.cb.att.com
(carl.h.bohman..jr) writes:
>Its a shame in my opinion that everyone has to worry about what
>his neighbor thinks, I thought thats what our country was founded
>on, individual freedom.
>I submit that all CCRs with respect to amateurs is a violation of
>the first amendment, freedom of speech. After all aren't CCRs restricting
>you 1st amendment right, even if your not an amateur. You aren't free
> ...
(A few lines have been deleted for brevity.)

I am not a lawyer, but as with many constitutional arguments, a balance has to be made among competing rights. Counteracting the right to free speech is the right to write contracts with others. After all a CC&R is nothing but a contract between a buyer and a seller. The buyer agrees to the contract while purchasing the property.

Rajiv

aa9ch

Address: r-dewan@nwu.edu

Phone: None on HF. Only CW.

Look for aa9ch/m on HF.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #202
